Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/800,346	MANSFIELD ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jared W. Newton	3634	
All Participants:	articipants: Status of Application:		
(1) Jared W. Newton (Examiner).	(3)	,	
(2) Clay Cunningham (Attorney).	(4)		
Date of Interview: 5 September 2006	Time: <u>2pm</u>		
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:			
Part I.	·		
Rejection(s) discussed: 112 rejections			
Claims discussed: 16,17	•		
Prior art documents discussed: none			
Part II.			
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet			
Part III.			
 ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. 			
Jordan			
Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/	'Applicant's Representative Si	ignature – if appropriate)	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-413B (04-03)

Application No. 10/800,346

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner requested clarification of the engagement between the body 46 and the pivot arms of the first lock member. The Attorney explained the engagement effectively, but acknowledged that said engagement was difficult to deduce from the drawings. In view of the telephonic interview, the Examiner maintains the 112 rejections in the instant Office Action..